

Amendments to Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Figure 1C for not being labeled as required by 37 CFR 1.84(t) and 1.84(u). Applicant has submitted herewith Replacement Drawings for Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C including such required labels. Also, the Replacement Drawings are in formal form.

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on February 16, 2008. Applicant has attached a Petition for a One Month Extension of Time, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.136, extending the statutory period until March 16, 2008. Applicant requests entry and consideration of the above noted amendments and the following remarks in response to the Office Action.

Claims 29-53 are currently pending in the application. Claim 54 has been withdrawn. Claims 29, 31, 42, and 53 have been amended. Claim 52 has been canceled.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to the Specification because on at least pages 6, 8 and 13, text appeared to be missing from the last line as a result of a photocopying error. The Examiner is correct that text was missing due to a photocopying error from pages 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, and 13. Applicant has therefore provided the corrected paragraphs above with the missing text underlined. Such matter is not new matter because such matter was in the original foreign filing and the text was missing due to a photocopying error. For that reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of such objection.

The Examiner further objected to the Specification for failing to contain a Brief Description of the Drawings. Applicant has amended the Specification to include such a section as indicated above. The description of the drawings can generally be found at page 5, first full paragraph. Applicant requests withdrawal of such objection.

The Examiner objected to the second page of the figures for not being labeled as required by 37 CFR 1.84(t) and 1.84(u). Applicant has provided Replacement Sheets wherein the appropriate labels are provided. Such Replacement Sheets also contain formal figures. Applicant requests withdrawal of such objection.

The Examiner objected to claim 31 for having a misspelled word, claim 42 for not further limiting the scope of the subject matter, and claim 29 for a subscripting error and a typographical error. Applicant has corrected claims 29 and 31 as identified in the Amendment to the Claims. Applicant has amended claim 42 to refer to R^3 instead of R^2 . Such error is believed to be a typographical error, and support for such amendment can

be found at least at page 10, first paragraph. Applicant also amended claim 29 to correct a typographical error in Formula (II). Applicant requests withdrawal of these objections.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 112, 2d ¶

Claim 29-51 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2d ¶, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claim 53 to be in independent form by including the limitations of claim 29. Applicant argues that claim 53 should have been dependent from claim 29, and such error was a typographical error. Support for this amendment is present in claim 53 itself. Applicant has amended claim 36 as suggested by the Examiner. Support for such amendment can be found at least at page 8, second to last paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 29 to include the limitations of claim 52 and has amended claim 53 to also include the limitations of claim 29. Support for such amendments is present in claims 52 and 53 themselves, and also at least at page 4, first and second full paragraphs. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 is moot. Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)

Claims 29-35, 37, 38, 50 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Winter et al. (U.S. 5,700,886). Claim 39 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winter. Claims 40-49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures of Winter and Razavi (U.S. 6,515,086).

Applicant has amended the claim 29 to incorporate the limitations of claim 52, which was deemed allowable by the Examiner. Applicant has also written claim 53 in independent form to include the limitations of claim 29 and addressed the indefiniteness issues. Support for such amendments is present in claims 52 and 53 themselves, and also at least at page 4, first and second full paragraphs. Therefore, these rejections are moot. Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that the references cited in the Office Action, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the presently amended claims. Having addressed all issues set out in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the same.

Date

03/07/08

Respectfully submitted,

Diane L. Kilpatrick-Lee

Diane L. Kilpatrick-Lee

Registration No. 56,211

FINA TECHNOLOGY, INC.

P.O. Box 674412

Houston, Texas, 77267-4412

Telephone: 713-483-5390

Facsimile: 713-483-5384

Attorney for Applicant(s)